

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION / MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE 1 OF 22 PAGES	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 1		3. EFFECTIVE DATE December 21, 2001		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO 10287/2520		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY United States Agency for International Development To all Offerors/Bidders		CODE		7. ADMINISTERED BY United States Agency for International Development M/OP/G-EGAD RRB 7.09-123 Washington, D. C. 20523-7100 Attention: RFP M/OP-01-1363		CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP code)				x		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.	
				<input type="checkbox"/>		M/OP-01-1363	
				<input type="checkbox"/>		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) November 20, 2001	
				<input type="checkbox"/>		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
CODE				FACILITY CODE		<input type="checkbox"/>	
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offerors must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.</p>							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
<input type="checkbox"/> A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify Authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
<input type="checkbox"/> B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY							
<input type="checkbox"/> C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
<input type="checkbox"/> D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible)							
See Continuation Pages 2-22.							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
				Michael B. Gushue			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED	
(Signature of person authorized to sign)				(Signature of person authorized to sign)			

AMENDMENT 1
CONTINUATION PAGES: 2 - 22:

Amendment Number 1 to RFP M/OP-01-1363 - Accelerated Microenterprise Advancement Project contains the following sections: A). Potential Offerors' Questions and USAID Responses Regarding RFP M/OP-01-1363 (some responses include substantial and minor revisions to RFP document); B). A list of organizations requesting to be placed on a distribution list for amendments to RFP M/OP-01-1363; C). Summary of Revisions to Clauses Substantially Changed in RFP M/OP-01-1363; and Section D - Attachments A - Areas of Substantive Involvement and B - Price Evaluation Matrix.

NOTE: The Following **Minor Revision**: All references to "G/EGAD/MD" in the RFP are hereby changed to "EGAT/MD."

Section A - Potential Offerors' Questions and USAID Responses Regarding RFP M/OP-01-1363

(Some responses include substantial and minor revisions to RFP)

1) With regard to Section B.5, page 7, Establishment of Indirect Costs (ODCS), does USAID expect the offeror to propose indirect cost rates that will be applicable for the contract periods, or will the contractor recover NICRA rates as applicable?

Response - It is stated in Section B.9 - Price Schedule that "each fixed daily rate listed in Attachment 7 - Table of Fixed Daily Rates is "loaded" and shall include . . . indirect costs applicable to labor . . ." The loaded indirect costs referenced in Section B.9 are applied to and remain fixed for the contract periods listed in Attachment 7. Offerors will proposed fixed daily rates, that include indirect costs applicable to labor, and are applicable to the contract periods listed in Attachment 7.

Additionally, it is stated in Section B.4 - Other Direct Costs "(Note: USAID will allow contractors to recover applicable indirect costs (i. e., overhead, G&A, etc.) on other direct costs (ODCs), if it is part of the contractor's usual accounting procedures, consistent with FAR Part 31, and Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA)). " USAID will allow indirect costs, meeting the criteria given in Section B.4, to be recovered.

Section B.5 - Establishment of Indirect Costs (ODCS) - It is stated that indirect costs rates shall be established for each of the Contractor's accounting periods which apply to this contract. Negotiated provisional rate(s) applied to the base(s) are applicable to ODCs under task orders pending establishment of revised provisional, final, or revised predetermined indirect cost rates. The chart in Section B.5 can be completed based on an offeror's negotiated indirect cost rate agreement (NICRA). Indirect costs can be recovered pursuant to Section B.4 - Other Direct Costs.

2) Please clarify what costs fall into the category of "Other Direct Costs". Does this include research and grant mechanisms?

Response - Section B.9 - Price Schedule provides a description of other direct costs. Fixed daily rates shall not include or be applied to costs covered as other direct costs. Cost and fee elements that make up the loaded fixed daily rates are also described in Section B.9. Specific other direct cost line item amounts are proposed by contractors under task orders and are subject to negotiation with the Government. As described in Section B.4 - "Other direct costs necessary for the performance of the work under task orders . . . may be authorized in the task order."

3) In Section C.3(a) on page 16 under Microfinance, the RFP states that this includes the "...legal and regulatory environment for microfinance." Under Enabling Environment, the RFP states that this refers to the "...host of policies, incentives, actions and research." Does this mean that legal and regulatory environment issues will not be covered under the Enabling Environment component/contract?

Response - Legal and regulatory issues can be addressed in task orders under both the Micro Finance and Enabling Environment areas of substantive involvement. The Enabling Environment sector covers a wider range of policy issues.

4) In section C.3, paragraph (b), page 19, grants management is listed as an element in AMAP Support Services. Is grants management a function in all components, or only in the Support Services component?

Response - Only the AMAP Support Services function involves implementation and administration of a small grants program; this is a small business set-aside. The Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment areas of substantive involvement do not include implementation and administration of a small grants program.

5) The government estimates spending \$94 million on technical assistance services, which is projected to purchase 120,000 person days of services. (see p. 14 of 22) Does this estimate include local professional technical assistance, as well as expatriate technical assistance?

Response - The Government estimate includes local professional technical as well as expatriate technical assistance.

6) In Paragraph C.4, Standards of Performance, USAID states that one of the criteria of inferior performance on Timeliness and Contractor Responsiveness is "a contractors dogged reliance on terms of reference and an inability to adjust approaches as circumstances dictate." It seems to us that this criterion could easily be interpreted by many CTOs as an invitation for a contractor to work out of scope, with all of the cost and other risk that this implies. Where does the Contracting Officer see the line being drawn between contractor flexibility and a CTO's unauthorized commitment?

Response - Offerors should not interpret this measurement of the "Timeliness of Performance and Contractor Responsiveness" as an "invitation for a contractor to work out of scope". What is desired of the contractor is flexibility in performing the work requirement and responsiveness to requests of the CTO, that are within the scope of work, in order to complete task order work in a timely fashion. The contractor should contact the Contracting Officer if it appears there is a problem of working outside the scope of work. Contractors shall not, at any time, perform work that is outside the scope of the specified statement of work, nor shall contractors perform work that will entail exceeding any specified ceiling amount or price, except at their own risk. Work outside the scope of the statement of work or that increase the ceiling amount must be authorized by the contracting officer.

7) Page 18 mentions microenterprise results reporting under the three technical areas. It is also mentioned on page 19. Where does the responsibility lie?

Response - Microenterprise results reporting is primarily an AMAP Support Services activity, although task orders in the three technical areas of substantive involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) could contribute to results reporting in various USAID operating units.

8) Page 18 - Mentions developing and maintaining "e-based systems" under the three technical areas. This seems to be similar to the reporting & performance measurement mentioned on p. 19. Where does the responsibility lie?

Response - The AMAP Support Services function will take the lead in establishing e-based communication within USAID, but the three technical areas of substantive involvement could also contribute to this activity.

9) Page 12, first full paragraph, and Page 15, first full paragraph, both describe AMAP objectives, but in somewhat different terms. Which description is the one we should follow?

Response - The Statement of AMAP objectives described on pages 12 and 15 cover the same basic points. Offerors should review all objectives listed on these pages in preparing their proposals.

10) Key personnel requirements are noted in Section F.4, page 26. While the term "key personnel" generally involves contractual implications with respect to that person being essential to the work and therefore limiting substitutions, the term "key specialists" is also used in the RFP. Is it correct that this term, "key specialist", does not carry the same contractual meaning as "key personnel"? Does USAID intend that individuals other than the Project Manager be assigned the contractual status of "key personnel"?

Response/Minor Revision - All references to the term "key specialist" in the RFP are hereby changed to the term "key personnel". Please also review response to questions 15-15G below.

11) Under Section F.7, paragraph 7, page 28, as currently written in the RFP, the last sentence would appear to impose an obligation on all selected contractors to compete for all Task Orders. It is assumed that the intended meaning of the last sentence is properly expressed as "All task orders for Area(s) of Substantive Involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) will be subject to competition among contractors receiving award(s) under the initial full and open competition". Please verify.

Response/Substantial Revision - Contractors are not required to submit proposals and compete for task orders under the three areas of substantive involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) or the AMAP Support Services Functional area. Contractors can submit proposals and compete for task orders at their discretion. Section F.8 - Fair Opportunity to be Considered - Paragraph 7, on page 28 of 122 is revised as follows:

Section F.8 - Fair Opportunity to be Considered, Page 28 of Page 122, Paragraph 7, Revised as Follows:

7. For a task order competition, the Government will designate in the Program Description which contractors will be eligible and can compete for a task order. Small Business contractors awarded contracts under the small business set aside can compete at their discretion for all task orders for the AMAP Support Services Function. Contractors receiving award(s) under the full and open competitions can compete at their discretion for all task orders for Area(s) of Substantive Involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) for which they received contract award(s).

12) F.7 of the RFP states "In no event shall the aggregate total of all task orders exceed the Maximum Ordering Limitation authorized in the contract." Will there be a limit set for each contract award? If so, will it be possible to amend the limit on an individual contract if one awardee reaches the limit and other contractors do not seem to be actively using the contract mechanism? Or, will there be only an aggregate total for all contracts with no segmentation of the total award value?

Response - As stated in Section B.8 - Minimum and Maximum for Contract "the maximum cumulative amount for all contract awards under the Accelerated Microenterprise Advancement Project (AMAP) is \$180,000,000". No ceiling amount maximum, other than the maximum cumulative amount of \$180,000,000, will exist for individual contracts awarded under this RFP.

13) Under Section H.2, paragraph (a), page 42, the geographic code restricts the procurement of services to Code 000. This has the effect of precluding the inclusion of foreign firms/NGOs from appearing on the offeror's consortium, even if such firm/NGO has an appropriate specialized expertise in the country or region of origin. Is this a correct interpretation of this requirement?

Response - Section H.2 AIDAR 752.225-70 Source, Origin and Nationality Requirements states that "The authorized source for procurement is Geographic Code 000 unless otherwise specified in the schedule of the contract." Your interpretation of this AIDAR clause is correct.

14) In Section L.11 (d)(2) on page 84, the RFP instructs the offeror to provide a statement of total dollars that the offeror plans to be subcontracted in various ways. Since this is an IQC with no certainty of specific dollar awards per Task Order, or of the particular range of expertise demanded per Task Order, it is not possible to provide this information. Can this be stated as a general percentage target instead?

Response/Minor Revision - Section L.11 52.219-9 Small Business Subcontracting Plan is a FAR clause which cannot be modified. Offerors should submit estimated dollar amounts for L.11(d)(2) (i-vi) and express these items in percentage terms.

15) For the cost proposal, is it required to submit a CV as part of the assumptions in justifying the daily rate?

15A) Aside from the position of Project Manager, is it left to the individual offeror to determine those positions for which it will submit CVs and/or biographical descriptions? Does the Government wish to see one of more CVs for each of the labor categories listed in Attachment 7 (p. 119 of 122)? For each level of professional within each of those labor categories?

15B) Is there a specified/maximum/minimum number of resumes requested for each labor category and/or level? If so, what is the requested number?

15C) It is unclear what USAID wishes submitted regarding staff for the RFP. Shall we submit resumes for staff other than the Project Manager? If so, how many?

15D) Are resumes required for people other than the project manager? For example, are we required to submit a resume for each labor category listed in bold in Attachment 7? Are resumes required for each subcategory under the nine main labor categories (in bold)? Is there a page limit for resumes?

15E) Attachment 2 (p. 103 of 122) is an Employee Biographical Data Sheet (EBD). For which personnel are EBDs to be submitted, either in this proposal or in task order proposals issued hereunder?

15F) Is there an expectation regarding the number of resumes that a consortium should submit?

15G) Does USAID expect offerors to submit illustrative candidates for each of the labor categories?

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 15 THROUGH 15G/Substantial Revision:

An Offeror should only submit one (1) resume for the proposed IQC Project Manager and one (1) resume each for individuals proposed as key personnel members. These resumes will be contained in an appendix to the offeror's Technical Proposal and will not be included in the 25 page limit for a Technical Proposal. While there is no page limit for resumes they should be reasonably concise.

As stated in paragraph (b) on page 94 of 122 an offeror will "submit a written statement on its Personnel responding to the evaluation criteria set forth in Section M as it relates to performance of the tasks outlined in Section C of this solicitation. Offerors should clarify the roles of staff and any expected subcontracting relationships . . . Offerors should describe the specific qualifications of the proposed IQC Project Manager and key personnel who will be involved in the implementation of substantive areas of the project including strategic planning, operational support, etc."

Offerors will need to identify their proposed key personnel in this written statement (IQC Project Manager and others). It is optional if offerors includes in their written statements descriptions of non-key personnel. Successful offerors that are awarded contracts will have these personnel listed in Section F.4 - Key Personnel (includes IQC Project Manager).

The Contractor Employee Biographical Data Sheet should be completed only for the proposed IQC Project Manager and other individuals identified by the offeror as also being key personnel (include in appendix to Technical Proposal and is not included in 25 page limit). The Contracting Officer will have discretion over requesting contractor employee biographical data sheets and resumes for task order work.

Section L.16 - Instructions, 3. - Technical Proposal, Paragraph (d), Page 95 of 122, Revised as Follows:

d) IQC Project Manager/Other Key Personnel: The offeror will submit one (1) resume for the person proposed as the IQC Project Manager. The IQC Project Manager will have the knowledge and experience in microenterprise development; ability to attract, lead, manage and retain a diverse team of microenterprise professionals; contribute to the body of microenterprise development theory; and have strong interpersonal and communications skills. In addition to the IQC Project Manager, the offeror will submit one (1) resume each for other individuals identified as key personnel members in its Proposal. Resumes will be placed in an appendix to the Technical Proposal and will not be included in the 25 page limit.

16) In Paragraph B.9.3, Labor Categories - Levels of Qualifications, are the years of work experience that may substitute for advanced educational degrees in addition to or included in the years of experience for each level mentioned in the first sentence of each paragraph?

Response - An expert may substitute additional years of experience in the field of microenterprise development for an advanced educational degree. For example, a candidate without an advanced degree, would qualify as a Level III expert by having a minimum of 7 years, rather than 5 years substantive involvement in the field of microenterprise development. The requirement of 10 years of experience in his/her area of specialization would remain unchanged.

17) Please confirm that we are to provide fixed daily labor rates for Level I Microenterprise Strategic Planning Specialists and for Microenterprise Legal and Regulatory Specialists, despite the absence of blank lines for those rates.

Response - Offerors are instructed NOT to provide fixed daily rates for the Level 1 Microenterprise Strategic Planning Specialists and Microenterprise Legal and Regulatory Specialists labor categories as shown on Attachment 7 - Table of Fixed Daily Rates. Fixed daily rates for all other labor categories and levels on this chart are to be completed by offerors.

17A) Are there any Level One slots for the first two labor categories on page 119?

Response - See answer to question number 17 above.

18) Do all of the labor categories pertain to each area of competition under the RFP or is it the responsibility of the offeror to choose the most relevant categories for each specific area?

Response - It is anticipated that all labor categories and levels listed in Attachment 7 - Table of Fixed Daily Rates will all be used for contracts under each area of substantive involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) and the AMAP Support Services function. Attachment 7 - Table of Fixed Daily Rates should be completely filled out by all offerors (also see response to question number 17 above).

19) Is USAID expecting the consortia to submit one illustrative resume for each subcontractor for each labor category level, i.e. 3 resumes for each Level, and in this way calculate the average daily rate? This means that a three member consortium will submit illustrative resumes for each Level for each category they have expertise in, or a maximum of 81(9x3x3) resumes. Please advise.

Response - Please review response to questions 15 - 15 G, 17, and 18 above.

20) The project manager is expected to play a key role in the personnel team and bring specific technical skills to the project. If the offeror chooses to submit proposals in multiple areas of competition under the RFP, will USAID expect a single project manager for all areas proposed, or a separate candidate for each proposal.

Response - In the scenario presented in your question where an offeror is making multiple proposals, it is up to the discretion and a business decision for the offeror whether to propose a single or multiple individuals for the position of IQC Project Manager. An offeror will need to demonstrate in its proposal that the IQC Project Manager(s) has sufficient available time to perform job duties.

20A) On page 14 of the RFP, the IQC Project Manager is asked to "have made specific contributions to microenterprise development theory". Please elaborate on what is meant by this requirement, perhaps by means of illustrations.

Response - The IQC Project Manager should have recognized experience in the development of microenterprise development theory and practice. The individual should have contributed to microenterprise development theory in a role as a leading practitioner or researcher.

20B) One of the key positions defined in Section F4 of the RFP is the IQC Project Manager. Section B of the RFP refers to a Task Order Manager. Assuming that these are two different positions, could you please clarify the division of responsibilities between the two?

Response/Minor Revision - The reference in Section B.9 - Price Schedule (3. Labor Categories - Levels of Qualifications) on page 10 of 122 states "The contractor will have a 'task order manager'". The "task order manager" is corrected to read "IQC Project Manager"; the terms refer to the same position.

20C) We noted that the RFP emphasizes the qualifications of the proposed project manager yet it does not address the issue of billability for this position. In the Microserve and SEGIR FS IQCs, the project manager was allowed 80 person days of billable time per year. Will the AMAP IQC be structured in a similar manner?

Response/Substantial Revision:

Section B.9 - Price Schedule, Page 9 of 122, New Paragraph 1A is Added

1A. - Direct Charge for IQC Project Manager

Subject to the prior approval of the contracting technical officer, the IQC Project Manager may perform services under task orders and the contractor may request payment for services rendered by the contract. However, under no circumstances shall the IQC Project Manager provide more than a total of eighty (80) days of effort as a direct charge under task orders to this contract in any given year. For audit purposes, the contractor shall maintain an updated record of the total workdays provided by the IQC Project Manager under task orders and provide the list to the contracting officer upon request. The contractor's management structure should clearly indicate who will act as the principal point of contact in the absence of the IQC Project Manager.

20D) Can the IQC project manager be a non-U.S. citizen?

Response - There is no requirement that the IQC project manager for the contractor be a U. S. citizen if this is an individual who is a contractor employee and works in the United States. A non-U. S. citizen is legally required to meet all Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) regulations and VISA requirements. The person must be lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States (see AIDAR 725.70). The nationality of contractor employees is covered by 22 CFR 228.37.

If the IQC Project Manager is not a contractor employee, such as a consultant under a subcontract, then source/origin/nationality limits in RFP Code 000 apply and the regulation reference that applies is 22 CFR 228.31. In a subcontract arrangement, the individual would have to be a U. S. citizen or "a non- U. S. citizen lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States".

21) The intent, content and expected use by offerors of Attachment 8 (Areas of Substantive Involvement and Functions) is not clear. Please clarify.

21A) Please provide further explanation of the graphic depicted in Attachment 8 (found on page 121 of 122), which is also referenced as Attachment 9 on p. 15 of 122. Do the shaded areas reflect the Government's expectations of the number of successful offerors in each area of substantive involvement? Is the graphic intended to suggest that it is not necessary for each offeror to provide the full range of functions expected in each area of substantive involvement? What is the meaning of the white spaces in the graphic?

21B) Please elaborate on the chart entitled illustrative Involvement of Offerors in AMAP (attachment 8, page 121).

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 21, 21A, and 21B/ (See Attachment A - Areas of Substantive Involvement):

A problem occurred in the electronic transmission of Attachment 8 - Areas of Substantive Involvement; the revised chart is presented in Attachment A. Offerors are advised to read RFP Section L.16 - Instructions (Business Proposal and Technical Proposal) for information on how to respond to this RFP.

The revised chart in Attachment A is provided for illustrative purposes and is intended to show the sectors of work for this requirement and to provide an example of how different firms could submit proposals for the three areas of substantive involvement and AMAP Support Services function. The chart is intended as a resource in helping offerors to understand this requirement.

The chart in Attachment A shows the three Areas of Substantive Involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) each encompassing the Strategic Planning, Institutional Support, Human Capacity Development, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Knowledge Generation functions for which there will be full and open competitions. The AMAP Support Services Function, encompassing the Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment areas of substantive involvement is a small business set-aside.

In the revised illustrative chart (Attachment A to Amendment 1) Offeror 1 submits one (1) Proposal only for the Micro Finance Area of Substantive Involvement (encompassing all Functions except AMAP Support Services); Offeror 2 submits two (2) separate Proposals for the Business Development Services and Enabling Environment Areas of Substantive Involvement (each encompassing all Functions except AMAP Support Services); and Offeror 3 is a small business firm that submits only one (1) Proposal for the AMAP Support Services Function (encompassing all three (3) Areas of Substantive Involvement).

There are four (4) separate competitions, under this RFP, which it is anticipated will result in multiple awards for each of the following:

- A. Full and Open Competition for the Micro Finance Area of Substantive Involvement (see Section C). It is anticipated that up to 3 contract awards will be made for this Area.

- B. Full and Open Competition for the Business Development Services Area of Substantive Involvement (see Section C). It is anticipated that up to 3 contract awards will be made for this Area.
- C. Full and Open Competition for the Enabling Environment Area of Substantive Involvement (see Section C). It is anticipated that up to 3 contract awards will be made for this Area.
- D. Small Business Set-Aside competition among small, disadvantaged, women-owned, veteran-owned and HUB Zone small businesses for the AMAP Support Services Function (see Section C). It is anticipated that up to 2 contract awards will be made for this area.

The Government requires that offerors submit separate Proposals for any or all of the above four (4) listed items for which offerors choose to submit Proposals (Number 4 - the AMAP Support Services Function is limited to competition among small businesses). Offerors will clearly mark on the cover sheet of each Technical and Business Proposal for which of the above four (4) listed items it applies.

The reference to Attachment 9 on page 15 of 122 is incorrect; the correct number is Attachment 8.

22) Is the 25-page limit on the technical response inclusive of the table of contents (see p. 90 of 122)

22A) Does the biography of the Project Manager count against the 25 page limit? Do other resumes count against the limit or can they be put into an annex?

22B) Page 90 of the RFP states, "Proposals should not exceed 25 pages in length, single spaced, to include pagination, and table of contents. Items such as graphs, charts, cover pages, dividers, table of contents, attachments, and other items specified below are not included in this document length." Please clarify whether or not the table of contents is included in the 25 page limit.

22C) Is the past performance/capacity information required in section M4 to be included as an attachment or is it within the 25 pp. technical proposal page limit? In section L16, instructions, states that "The past performance references required in this RFP should be included as an annex or attachment of the technical proposal," but it is not clear that this is the same information as the past performance/capacity information required in section M4.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 22, 22A, 22B, AND 22C/Minor Revision:

The 25 page Proposal limit does not include the table of contents. Written biographical information about the proposed IQC Project Manager is included in the 25 page limit. Resumes and contractor employee biographical data sheets can be placed in an appendix to the technical proposal and do not count against the 25 page limit. Clause L.16 - Instructions (3)(c)(page 94 of 122) describes the offeror's written statement regarding Offeror's Past Performance/Capacity which is included in the 25 page limit. Section L.16 - Instructions (page 89 of 122) indicates that past performance references will be provided as an attachment to the technical proposal which is not included in the 25 page limit. The past performance/capacity information in Section L.16 and Section M.4 -Technical Evaluation Criteria are the same.

23) What is the time limit for submission of clarification questions (see conflicting references on p. 89 of 122)?

23A) Both in the cover letter and on page 89 of the RFP, USAID states that written questions must be submitted no later than 20 days following the issuance of the RFP. However, page 89 of the RFP also states that clarifications on the instructions for the RFP should be sent to the Contracting Officer no more than 15 days after the issuance of the RFP. Please clarify the cut off date for submission of questions regarding the RFP.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 23 AND 23A/Minor Revision:

The cut-off date for submission of written questions regarding this RFP was December 10, 2001 which is 20 days after the RFP was issued on November 20, 2001. The references in the Cover Letter and Section L.15 - General Instructions to Offerors to a cut-off date of 20 days after issuance of the RFP for receipt of written questions are correct. The reference to a shorter 15 day cut-off period in Section L.14 - General Information (top of page 89) is incorrect.

24) Is it possible to obtain an example of the standard price evaluation matrix cited on p. 101 of 122? How will an offeror's price be calculated and evaluated?

24A) How will the cost evaluation be carried out? Will the committee come up with one average price for all the labor and level categories? If so, what will be the weighting applied to each level and labor category.

24B) Since only one rate per item in Attachment F is requested, does USAID intend to provide instructions regarding how its budget calculations will be made?

24C) Can USAID provide the weighting, ranking or percentage given for the technical proposal and the cost proposal?

24D) Section M.5 states, "The price/business evaluation for all offerors business proposals will be conducted using a standard price evaluation matrix." Please provide an example of a standard price evaluation matrix.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 24, 24A, 24B, 24C, and 24D (See Attachment B - Price Evaluation Matrix):

Attachment B - Price Evaluation Matrix, is a copy of the price evaluation matrix that USAID plans to use to conduct price/business evaluations. Section M.3 - Evaluation Criteria, provides a complete description of how technical proposals will be evaluated.

25) Tier 3 competitions (i.e., all task order competitions in which the task order is projected to exceed \$2 million) will apparently not require a technical approach and will feature cost/price factors as more important than technical factors (see p. 28 of 122). To what degree will cost/price factors outweigh technical factors. Will T.O. competitions remain "best value" competitions?

Response - Task Order instructions may request offerors to provide their technical approaches to a Government statement of work. The technical factors that will be evaluated under Tier 3 competitions include performance/experience, personnel qualifications, and schedule of availability as described in Section F.8 (4) - Fair Opportunity to be Considered. While technical factors represent important selection criteria in Tier 3 competitions, cost/price factors are more important selection criteria. Technical and cost/price factors will be used to evaluate contractors task order proposals under Tiers 1, 2, and 3 (Section F.8, paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 - page 28 of 122).

26) Will technical approaches ever be requested in any T.O. competition managed under AMAP? Will Contracting Officers for individual task orders (e.g., a mission Contracting Officer) have the ability to request and consider any information from offerors other than that which is listed on p. 28 of 122?

Response - As described in the answer to question number 25, the Contracting Officer retains the flexibility to request contractors to provide technical approaches to task order statements of work. The basis for selection of contractors for task order awards is described in Section F.8 - Fair Opportunity to be Considered, paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 (Tier One, Tier Two, and Tier Three).

27) To whom does the ES-6 salary cap (described on p. 44 of 122) apply? Does it apply only to personnel working under multipliers (as opposed to those who fall into the labor categories and qualify for compensation from the Fixed Daily Rates)?

Response - Clause H.8 - Personnel Compensation, paragraph 2 describes the "... ceiling on the reimbursable base salary or wage paid to personnel under the Contract equivalent to the maximum annual salary rate of the USAID ES-6 (or the equivalent daily rate of the maximum ES-6 salary, if compensation is not calculated on an annual basis), as amended from time to time, unless an advance written waiver is granted by the USAID Procurement Executive prior to contract award." The Table of Fixed Daily Rates for U. S. Personnel does not include salaried employees; therefore the ES-6 salary ceiling does not apply. Clause H.8 - Personnel Compensation (ES-6 salary ceiling) does apply to salaried Non-U. S. Personnel.

28) Please clarify whether AMAP contract holders are required to compete for all task orders issued under contracts they hold (see p. 28 of 122), including those task orders that, if won, may preclude their competing for related work that may be procured in the future (see p. 46 of 122).

Response - AMAP contract holders are not required to compete for task orders (see answer to Question Number 11).

28A) Since there may be two AMAP small business set-aside contractors, both of whom may have overlapping roles in assisting G/EGAD/M administration and dialog with other contractors, how will USAID manage these two competitors? Will each task order contain a budget for separate long-term on-site support staff (i.e. IQC Manager, etc.), separate office space, and equipment/supplies? Will there be different CTOs for each AMAP small business set-aside contractor?

Response - The work for the AMAP Support Services function will flow out of task orders. Please review Section F.8 - Fair Opportunity to Be Considered and Section F.11 - Contents of Task Orders. Contractors will submit budgets as part of their task order proposals; offerors should also review the response to question number 30. It has not been determined if there will be more than one AMAP Support Services CTO (if there is more than one AMAP Support Services contractor).

28B) In bidding for the support services contract, is it permissible to subcontract with other firms for that work; and if so, do they also need to be small businesses? (question from small business firm)

Response - AMAP Support Service contractors can subcontract with other firms. Clause I.9 - AIDAR 752.219-8 Utilization of Small Business Concerns and Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns requires the contractor to carry out the USAID policy regarding the award of subcontracts to small businesses to the fullest extent consistent with efficient contract performance.

28C) If there are two AMAP small business set-aside contractors, and one is awarded the monitoring and evaluation task order, will the winner do the monitoring and evaluation of the other?

Response - It is not expected that one AMAP Support Service contractor will evaluate another AMAP Support Service contractor. (*if there is more than one AMAP Support Services contractor*)

28D) Will the AMAP small business set-aside contractor have any role in the evaluation of the task orders by the other AMAP contractors?

Response - AMAP Support Service contractors may evaluate other AMAP contractors with contracts in the Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment areas of substantive involvement.

29) Please clarify whether an offeror's proprietary products and services developed from the offeror's own funds, but which may have been used in the field on an AMAP T.O., and therefore included in an AMAP report? can and will be published by the government on the web site described on p. 34 of 122.

Response - FAR 52.227-14 - Rights in Data General; AIDAR 752.7034 - Acknowledgement and Disclaimer; and AIDAR 752.7035 - Public Notices shall govern intellectual property rights and the posting of information on a USAID internet web site. Specific questions regarding intellectual property rights can be fully addressed when USAID releases statements of work for task orders.

30) The RFP indicates several requirements for home office management support. For example, contractors are required to complete annual work plans and progress reports that project major publications and technical assistance, and reflect on the lessons learned during a given period (see p. 34 of 122). These requirements differ substantially from those of normal "contract management" and "home/corporate office administrative support," the costs of which are supposed to be included in the Fixed Daily Rates (see p. 9 of 122). Will such management support costs be directly billable to an AMAP T.O., or should they be included in the fixed daily rates?

Response - It is stated in Section B.9 - Price Schedule (1. - U. S. Personnel - Fixed Daily Rates) on page 9 of 122 that "each fixed daily rate listed in Attachment 7 - Table of Fixed Daily Rates is 'loaded' and shall include the salary cost or consulting fee of the individual providing the services, payroll costs (fringe benefits, FICA, etc.), indirect costs applicable to labor, all home/corporate office /secretarial/administrative support (Domestic and International), all computer rental (Domestic and International), all report preparation costs, contract management (See Section C), DBA, MEDEVAC and profit or fee, if any." Report preparation costs; home/corporate office/secretarial/ administrative support; and contract management costs such as the costs you cite should be included in the loaded fixed daily rates.

31) The language in the last sentences of the Notes at the end of Paragraphs B.9.1 and B.9.5 leave it to the discretion of individual Contracting Officers whether contractors may propose out-year rates or multipliers for task order extensions that cross rate/multiplier years. Given that task orders are frequently extended for relatively lengthy periods, we request that the Government consider revising that language to unambiguously permit contractors to include out-year rates/multipliers in extension proposals.

Response - USAID has decided not to make any changes to Section B.9 - Price Schedule (paragraphs 1 and 5) given that we believe it is important for contracting officers to maintain discretion over allowable rates.

32) Will contractors be expected to award grants under task orders, and if so, will grant amounts be counted against the IQC ceiling amount?

Response - AMAP Support Service contractors will be responsible for implementing and administering a small grants program (see Section C.3.b), which includes making small grant awards. Section B.7 - Task Order Limitations (paragraphs 2 - Maximum Order) does not apply to the award amount of a small grant. Section B.8 - Minimum and Maximum for Contract (paragraph 2 - Maximum Ordering Limitation) also does not apply to the amount of a grant award.

33) Paragraph B-8 of the RFP states that the maximum cumulative amount for all contract awards is \$180 million. Could you please give us an order-of-magnitude estimate or to how much of \$180 million is projected for the AMAP Support Services awards? Is there an incumbent support services contractor? If so, who is the contractor, what is the dollar value of that contract, and how long was that contract for (duration)?

Response - The amount will be determined through the award of task orders for the AMAP Support Services function. Barents Group, LLC and its subcontractor Weidemann Associates, Inc. have performed AMAP Support Services type work under SEGIR/GBTI contract number PCE-I-00-98-00012-00. The ceiling price is \$1,675,527. The effective date is June 18, 2001 and the completion date is June 17, 2003.

34) What are the points/weights assigned to the technical evaluation criteria listed on Section M.4 (pp. 99-100)?

34A) How will the evaluation points be allocated among the different evaluation criteria? Currently, as presented in the RFP, there are no points assigned.

34B) Can USAID provide weighting, percentage, or ranking for the evaluation criteria in Section M?

34C) Since there is no percentage or point weighting listed for the Technical Evaluation Criteria under section M.4, pages 99 -100, is it correct to assume that all four components listed are equally weighted?

34D) No numerical weighting is given in Section M as a part of the Technical Evaluation Criteria. How does USAID intend to score the proposals in each area of substantive involvement?

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 34, 34A, 34B, 34C AND 34D:

It is stated in Section M.3 - Evaluation Criteria, paragraph 1 that "Technical Proposals will be rank ordered by a technical evaluation committee using the criteria given in Section M. The technical factors, as a whole, including Technical Understanding/Technical Approach, Personnel, Past Performance/Capacity, and Participation by Small Business Concerns and Disadvantaged Enterprises will be evaluated in the AGGREGATE, and not separately". A point system will not be used to score and rank offerors' technical proposals. The evaluation criteria given in Section M.4 - Technical Evaluation Criteria will be considered in the aggregate (total or whole with reference to its constituent parts) by the technical evaluation panel in ranking offerors' technical proposals from highest to lowest ranked. Consistent with the above, technical factors including Technical Understanding/Technical Approach, Personnel, Past Performance/Capacity, and Participation by Small Business Concerns and Disadvantaged Enterprises are of equal value and importance.

Substantial Revision - Section M.3 - Evaluation Criteria, Paragraph 1, Page 98 of 122, Revised as Follows:

1. Technical proposals will be rank ordered by a technical evaluation committee using the criteria given in Section M. The technical factors, as a whole, including Technical Understanding/Technical Approach, Personnel, Past Performance/Capacity, and Participation by Small Business Concerns and Disadvantaged Enterprises will be evaluated in the aggregate, and not separately. Technical factors including Technical Understanding/Technical Approach, Personnel, Past Performance/Capacity, and participation by Small Business Concerns and Disadvantaged Enterprises are of equal value and importance.

35) Will there be one evaluation committee evaluating all the bids for all the proposed substantive areas (i.e. microfinance, business development services and enabling environment)? Or will there be a separate committee for each Substantive Area?

Response -The structure of the evaluation panel has yet to be determined.

36) Can USAID better specify what it expects to see in each vision statement/technical approach for each Area of Substantive Involvement. As it currently reads, the evaluation criteria for all contracts (see page. 99; section M.4 - Technical Understanding/Technical Approach) asks that the contractor "demonstrate a convincing understanding of the microenterprise development field, past and present." It also asks for a "concise description of where the industry stands to date".

36A) The evaluation criteria are general and do not ask for a detailed analysis of where the industry and field is in respect to each of the Areas of Substantive Involvement (e.g. business development services). As such, it would be possible for a contractor to present a vision of how the field is evolving in general -- i.e. talk about microfinance, enabling environment and business development trends - without talking about the specific trends associated with each Substantive Area (e.g. business development services). And yet, the evaluation committee will presumably looking for each contractor's understanding of the specific contracted area of services. Please clarify to what extent USAID is looking for a comprehensive analysis of industry trends as opposed to a specific analysis of trends in each Area of Substantive Involvement.

Response to Questions 36 and 36A/Substantial Revision:

Section M.4 - Technical Evaluation Criteria, Page 99 of 122, Technical Evaluation Criteria, Technical Understanding/Technical Approach (only portion on page 99) Revised as Follows:

An offeror's Technical Understanding/Technical Approach will be evaluated based on its specific understanding and approach to the particular Substantive Area of Involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) or AMAP Support Services Function for which it is submitting its Technical Proposal and its general understanding of the microenterprise development field. Offerors should be able to demonstrate a convincing understanding of the microenterprise development field and the Area of Substantive Involvement or Function for which it submitted its technical proposal; past and present. To demonstrate this, the offeror should consider, amongst other things, providing a concise description of where the industry and particular Substantive Area of Involvement or Function stands to date, where it may be in five years and the critical problems that need to be resolved to meet this vision. Of particular importance is the offeror's understanding of the impact of USAID's past program investments and how these might be adjusted to meet the challenges of the future. EGAT/MD is most interested in the offeror's ability to demonstrate a logical consistency between the current situation, their future vision and the role that USAID investments could have on moving toward the latter (as it applies to the general field of microenterprise development and the Substantive Area of Involvement or Function for which the offeror has submitted its technical proposal). The offeror should clearly explain their thinking about the role of USAID clients and partners in achieving this vision and practical steps the offeror would take to include clients in program implementation. Offerors should demonstrate their ability to develop communications links that assure that lessons learned in AMAP implementation are shared with others. This will be especially important for the AMAP Support Services component

where there is a requirement to coordinate overall program implementation and to fulfill the knowledge generation requirements of this SOW. Offerors should be able to provide a clear and concise description of how they plan to organize themselves to provide the services under the IQC. Of particular interest will be the criteria and system the offeror will use (end of page 99)

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 36 and 36A (Continued)

Section L.16 - Instructions, 3. Technical Proposal, paragraph (a), Pages 93 and 94 of 122, Revised as Follows:

(a) Offerors' will demonstrate their Technical Understanding/Technical Approach of the general microenterprise Development field and the particular Substantive Area of Involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) or AMAP Support Services Function for which it is submitting its technical proposal. The offeror is required to submit a written statement on its Technical Understanding/Technical Approach responding to the evaluation criteria set forth in Section M as it relates to Technical Understanding/Technical Approach of the tasks outlined in Section C of this solicitation. Failure to submit a written statement on Technical Understanding/Technical Approach may disqualify an offeror.

In this written statement, offerors should be able to demonstrate a convincing understanding of the microenterprise development field, and the Substantive Area of Involvement or Function for which it submitted its technical proposal; past and present. To demonstrate this, the offerors should consider, amongst other things, providing a concise description of where the industry and particular area of Substantive Involvement or Function stands to date, where it may be in five years and the critical problems that need to be resolved to meet this vision. Offerors should demonstrate understanding of USAID's past program investments and how these might be adjusted to meet the challenges of the future. EGAT/MD is most interested in the offerors' ability to demonstrate a logical consistency between the current situation, their future vision and the role that USAID investments could have on moving toward the latter (as it applies to the general field of microenterprise development and the Substantial Area of Involvement or Function for which the offeror has submitted its technical proposal) (no change to remainder of paragraph a)

Minor Revision: Section "5" - Oral Presentation on page 96 of 122 is renumbered Section "4".

Offerors should carefully review Section C - Description/Specifications/Statement of Work in preparing their proposals.

37) For the small business set-aside awards, where will the work be performed?

Response - The work will be performed primarily in Washington, D. C., but will include work overseas.

37A) Will office space required to house and operate the AMAP Support Services staff be provided by USAID or does the contractor need to budget for the cost of providing for such space? If USAID provides the facilities, what other support will be provided by USAID i.e. telephone, xerox, fax, computer support, and office supplies, etc?

Response - USAID will not provide office space for USAID AMAP Support Service contractor(s). It is the responsibility of the contractor to provide the communication, copying, and office supply items you cite.

38) If we bid for the support services, are we precluded from bidding as a team member for one or more other of the three substantive area IQCs? (question from small business firm)

Response - Small business offerors are not be precluded from proposing as a team member for one or more of the three Substantive Areas in the scenario that you present.

39) Please clarify how and where subcontractors will be able to participate in the oral presentations. On pg. 97 section L.5.(e), it states that: "Should a single firm be proposed as a subcontractor under multiple offers, that firm is precluded from participation in any oral presentation made under this RFP. Should a single firm submit a proposal as a prime offeror and also be included under another proposal as a subcontractor, that firm shall only be permitted to participate in the oral presentation for its prime offer." Is this exclusion from the oral presentation only applicable to those firms who are proposed on more than one offer in one Area of Substantive Involvement? Or does it also apply to firms that participate exclusively in more than one Area of Substantive Involvement? For example, assume a firm is the Prime Contractor for the Microfinance Area (the only proposal on which it is bid in that Substantive Area) and is also bid as a Subcontractor for the Business Development Services Area (the only proposal on which it is bid in that substantive area). Can that firm participate in the oral presentation for both the Microfinance (as prime) and Business Development Services (as sub)?

Response to Question 39/Substantial Revision:

Section L.16 - Instructions, Paragraph "5" (corrected to "4") - Oral Presentation, "Note" Under subparagraph (e), Page 97 of 122, Revised as Follows:

Note: Only prime offerors will be allowed to give oral presentations. Subcontractors will not be allowed to participate in oral presentations.

40) In regard to statement in cover letter "4." Small Business Set-Aside competition among small, disadvantaged, women-owned, veteran-owned and HUB Zone small businesses for the AMAP Support Services Function (see Section C). It is anticipated that up to 2 contract awards will be made for this area."; what exactly is the qualifying criteria for "a small, veteran-owned business"?

Response- See FAR Part 19 - Small Business Programs and Subpart 19.1 -Size Standards, etc.

41) Question regarding the AMAP Support Services description of services, C.3 (b); The RFP states (page 19) that the Support Services contractor will be responsible for developing and administering a small grants program. Will the grant recipients be U. S. Non-Profit Organizations, Non-U. S. Non-Profit Organizations, or both? Or other types of entities? Is it correct to assume that the contractor will act for USAID in accordance with ADS 303.5?

Response - It is expected that grant recipients will include both U. S. and non-U. S. non-profit organizations. The contractor will act in accordance with ADS 303.5.

42) There will be two contracts set-aside for Small or Minority Businesses. Does this mean that for each Task Order issued for Support Services, it will be competed between the two firms?

Response - If two contracts are awarded for the AMAP Support Services function, then competition would take place between these firms for task orders. RFP Section L.14 - General Information states that "it is anticipated that up to two (2) contracts will be awarded for Small Business Set-Aside for AMAP Support Services Function (see Section C)."

43) Is the evaluation criteria for the IQC managers the same for set-aside AMAP Support Service contractors? The evaluation criteria for the AMAP IQC managers appears to be the same although the work of the AMAP Support Services contractors will be much different from that of the AMAP Substantive Involvement contractors.

Response - See response to question number 36A.

44) In order to better understand the strengths and weaknesses of the current G/EGAD/M operations in order to write the proposal, it would be helpful to meet with USAID personnel currently working in the office. What arrangements must contractors make in order to interview USAID personnel? Will the contracting officer identify with whom we can meet?

Response - Section L.16 - Instructions, subparagraph (h) (page 95 of 122) provides an internet web address for the Office of Microenterprise Development - www.mip.org - which provides program background information offerors may want to review. USAID does not plan to have offerors interview its staff.

45) What level of access will AMAP small business set-aside contractors have to personnel in the EGAT/MD office; will they be based in the RRB or in a separate site? To USAID intranet?

Response - Contractor(s) for the AMAP Support Services sector will have ready access to USAID personnel. Contractor(s) will be based off-site. Because of security considerations USAID staff will assist contractor(s) in obtaining information off its intranet site.

46) Will other Missions, Bureaus, Offices of USAID be permitted to buy in to services from the AMAP Support Services Awards, or will only EGAT/MD be able to utilize services from these contractors?

Response - The AMAP Support Services function is primarily to support the Office of Microenterprise Development. Other USAID operating units may be allowed to buy-in for services.

47) In previous IQC contracts, USAID has committed core funds to conduct research and other similar tasks. Will there be core funding available through USAID for the AMAP?

Response - "Core" funding will not be available to contract(s) under the AMAP Support Services function (or other sectors) as these will be IQC time and materials type contract(s). EGAT/MD anticipates preparing substantial multi-year task orders, similar to previous types of tasks undertaken under AIMS and MBP.

48) Can we exceed USAID maximum salaries for short-term consultants?

Response - Please see clause H.8 - Personnel Compensation (e) on page 45 of 122 which states "no compensation for consultants will be reimbursed unless their use under the contract has advance written approval of the Contracting Officer; and if such provision has been made or approval given, compensation shall not exceed 1) the highest rate of annual compensation received by the consultant during any full year of the immediately preceding three years or 2) the maximum daily salary rate of ES-6, whichever is less." Section H.8 controls the level of compensation of consultants, and the length of time a consultant works on this contract is irrelevant.

49) Section L, page 92 lists the Small Business Sub-Contracting Plan as being a part of the Business Proposal. In Section M, page 100, Participation by Small Business Concerns and Disadvantaged Enterprises, falls under the Technical Evaluation Criteria. Please clarify.

Response/Minor Revision - Offerors are directed to include the small business sub-contracting plan as an appendix to the technical proposal. This appendix is excluded from the 25-page limit for the technical proposal.

50) Is it the intention to issue multiple contract awards of indefinite quantity contracts with each being for a separate area or the combined areas of substantive involvement? The precedent has been to have IQCs issued to cover all of the substantive areas that require technical assistance whereas this Notice appears to be stating the opposite.

Response - Please review response to question numbers 21, 21A, and 21B.

51) For the small business set-aside what is meant by "support services function"?

Response - Please review RFP Section C.3(a) Technical Areas on pages 15 and 16 of 122 for a description of the AMAP Support Services function.

52) Why is an IQC award being anticipated for coverage of the same substantive areas of involvement as mentioned for the other IQC awards.

Response - Please review Section C.1 - General Description of the Contract which shows how this requirement is related to previous contracts in support of project activities of the Office of Microenterprise Development.

53) In the second paragraph of page 90, the RFP states that the offerors must submit (1) copy of their business proposal on a 3.5 inch computer disc in Word 97 and Excel compatible format. Can we submit the required electronic copies on CD-ROM rather than 3.5 inch diskettes?

Response - Offerors cannot submit their proposals in CD-ROM format in lieu of 3.5 inch diskettes, but may provide copies of their technical/business proposals in CD-ROM format in addition to providing them on 3.5 inch diskettes. This is necessary because some reviewers of the proposals may not have CD-ROM drives on their personal computers.

54) Could we get a list of requestors for this RFP?

Response:

Section B - A list of organizations requesting to be placed on a distribution list for amendments to RFP M/OP-01-1363 is listed below:

1. The Mitchell Group, Inc.
1816 11th Street, NW
Washington, D. C. 2000
2. Innovations Group, Inc.
5789 Wethersfield Drive
Phoenix, Arizona 85304-1840
3. World Education
44 Farnsworth Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02210
4. Monterey Consultants, Inc.
3572 Dayton-Xenia Road Suite 115
Dayton, Ohio 45432
5. Amex International, Inc.
1615 L Street, N. W., Suite 340
Washington, D. C. 20036
6. Chemonics International, Inc.
1133 20th Street, N. W., Suite 600
Washington, D. C. 20036
7. Management Systems International
600 Water Street, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20024
8. Development Alternatives, Inc.
7250 Woodmont Avenue
Suite 200
Bethesda, Maryland 20814
9. CHP International, Inc.
1040 North Boulevard
Suite 220
Oak Park, Illinois 603
10. The QED Group, LLC
4710 Bethesda Avenue, Suite 201
Bethesda, Maryland 20814
11. FLAG International
284 East Main Street
Newark, Delaware 19711
12. Louis Berger Group, Inc.
1819 H. Street, N. W., Suite 900
Washington, D. C. 20006
13. Development Associates
1730 N. Lynn Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209-2023
14. Carana Corporation
4350 North Fairfax Drive, Suite 500
Arlington, Virginia 22203
15. Weidemann Associates, Inc.
933 N. Kenore Street, Suite 405
Arlington, Virginia 22201

16. Change Management Group
1493 Vanderbilt Way
Marietta, Georgia 30068
17. Strategic Learning Services-DC
962 Wayne Avenue, Suite 910
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
18. DTSI
433 Executive Center
El Paso, Texas 79902
Rafael Adame - radtsi@elp.rr.com
19. Pricewaterhouse Coopers
1616 N. Fort Myer Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22209
20. Dev Tech Systems, Inc.
1700 North Moore Street, Suite 1550
Arlington, Virginia 22209
21. Vision Through Endless Innovation
504-G North Thomas Street, Suite 400
Arlington, Virginia 22203-2406
22. Milvets Systems Technology, Inc.
4601 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 300
Lanham, Maryland 20706
23. Ashford International, Inc.
2305 West Park Place Boulevard, Suite N
Stone Mountain, Georgia 30087
24. World Council of Credit Unions, Inc.
Madison, Wisconsin
25. MetaMetrics, Inc.
No Address Provided
26. AMDEX Corporation
8701 Georgia Avenue, Suite 410
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3713
27. RS Staffing Services, Inc.
722 W. College Avenue
Decatur, Georgia 30030
28. The Services Group, Inc.
No Address Provided
29. Value-Add, L.L.C.
8115 Fenton Street, Suite 214
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
30. IMMA Ltd.
International Management and Marketing Associates, LTD.
870 Market Street, Suite 1145
San Francisco, California 94102
31. Harlan Lee and Associates
9207 Briary Lane
Fairfax, Virginia 22031

32. KBM Group
1010 Wayne Avenue, Suite 240
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
33. SEDI (Social and Enterprise Development Innovations)
1110 Finch Avenue W., Suite #406
Toronto, Ontario
M3J 2T2 CANADA
34. Potomac Technical Advisors
9208 Orchard Brook Drive
Potomac, Maryland 20854
35. Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS)
University of Maryland
2105 Morrill Hall
College Park, Maryland 20742
36. Innovations Group, Inc.
5789 Wethersfield Drive
Glendale, Arizona 85304
37. International Trade Center
South-West Texas Border Region
1222 North Main, Suite 450
San, Antonio, Texas 78212

As a result of Amendment Number 1 to RFP M/OP-01-1363 - Accelerated Microenterprise Advancement Project (AMAP), the following sections are substantially changed as appear below.

Section C - Summary of Revisions to Clauses Substantially Changed in RFP M/OP-01-1363:

Section B.9 - Price Schedule, Page 9 of 122, New Paragraph 1A is Added

1A. - Direct Charge for IQC Project Manager

Subject to the prior approval of the contracting technical officer, the IQC Project Manager may perform services under task orders and the contractor may request payment for services rendered by the contract. However, under no circumstances shall the IQC Project Manager provide more than a total of eighty (80) days of effort as a direct charge under task orders to this contract in any given year. For audit purposes, the contractor shall maintain an updated record of the total workdays provided by the IQC Project Manager under task orders and provide the list to the contracting officer upon request. The contractor's management structure should clearly indicate who will act as the principal point of contact in the absence of the IQC Project Manager.

Section F.8 - Fair Opportunity to be Considered, Page 28 of Page 122, Paragraph 7, Revised as Follows:

7. For a task order competition, the Government will designate in the Program Description which contractors will be eligible and can compete for a task order. Small Business contractors awarded contracts under the small business set aside can compete at their discretion for all task orders for the AMAP Support Services Function. Contractors receiving award(s) under the full and open competitions can compete at their discretion for all task orders for Area(s) of Substantive Involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) for which they received contract award(s).

Section L.16 - Instructions, 3. Technical Proposal, paragraph (a), Pages 93 and 94 of 122, Revised as Follows:

(a) Offerors' will demonstrate their Technical Understanding/Technical Approach of the general microenterprise development field and the particular Substantive Area of Involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) or AMAP Support Services Function for which it is submitting its technical proposal. The offeror is required to submit a written statement on its Technical Understanding/Technical Approach responding to the evaluation criteria set forth in Section M as it relates to Technical Understanding/Technical Approach of the tasks outlined in Section C of this solicitation. Failure to submit a written statement on Technical Understanding/Technical Approach may disqualify an offeror.

In this written statement, offerors should be able to demonstrate a convincing understanding of the microenterprise development field, and the Substantive Area of Involvement or Function for which it submitted its technical proposal; past and present. To demonstrate this, the offerors should consider, amongst other things, providing a concise description of where the industry and particular area of Substantive Involvement or Function stands to date, where it may be in five years and the critical problems that need to be resolved to meet this vision. Offerors should demonstrate understanding of USAID's past program investments and how these might be adjusted to meet the challenges of the future. EGAT/MD is most interested in the offerors' ability to demonstrate a logical consistency between the current situation, their future vision and the role that USAID investments could have on moving toward the latter (as it applies to the general field of microenterprise development and the Substantial Area of Involvement or Function for which the offeror has submitted its technical proposal) (no change to remainder of paragraph a)

Section L.16 - Instructions, 3. - Technical Proposal, Paragraph (d), Page 95 of 122, Revised as Follows:

d) IQC Project Manager/Other Key Personnel: The offeror will submit one (1) resume for the person proposed as the IQC Project Manager. The IQC Project Manager will have the knowledge and experience in microenterprise development; ability to attract, lead, manage and retain a diverse team of microenterprise professionals; contribute to the body of microenterprise development theory; and have strong interpersonal and communications skills. In addition to the IQC Project Manager, the offeror will submit one (1) resume each for other individuals identified as key personnel members in its Proposal. Resumes will be placed in an appendix to the Technical Proposal and will not be included in the 25 page limit.

Section L.16 - Instructions, Paragraph "5" (corrected to "4") - Oral Presentation, "Note" Under subparagraph (e), Page 97 of 122, Revised as Follows:

Note: Only prime offerors will be allowed to give oral presentations. Subcontractors will not be allowed to participate in oral presentations.

Section M.3 - Evaluation Criteria, Paragraph 1, Page 98 of 122, Revised as Follows:

1. Technical proposals will be rank ordered by a technical evaluation committee using the criteria given in Section M. The technical factors, as a whole, including Technical Understanding/Technical Approach, Personnel, Past Performance/Capacity, and Participation by Small Business Concerns and Disadvantaged Enterprises will be evaluated in the aggregate, and not separately. Technical factors including Technical Understanding/Technical Approach, Personnel, Past Performance/Capacity, and participation by Small Business Concerns and Disadvantaged Enterprises are of equal value and importance.

Section M.4 - Technical Evaluation Criteria, Page 99 of 122, Technical Evaluation Criteria, Technical Understanding/Technical Approach (only portion on page 99) Revised as Follows:

An offeror's Technical Understanding/Technical Approach will be evaluated based on its specific understanding and approach to the particular Substantive Area of Involvement (Micro Finance, Business Development Services, and Enabling Environment) or AMAP Support Services Function for which it is submitting its Technical Proposal and its general understanding of the microenterprise development field. Offerors should be able to demonstrate a convincing understanding of the microenterprise development field and the Area of Substantive Involvement or Function for which it submitted its technical proposal; past and present. To demonstrate this, the offeror should consider, amongst other things, providing a concise description of where the industry and particular Substantive Area of Involvement or Function stands to date, where it may be in five years and the critical problems that need to be resolved to meet this vision. Of particular importance is the offeror's understanding of the impact of USAID's past program investments and how these might be adjusted to meet the challenges of the future. EGAT/MD is most interested in the offeror's ability to demonstrate a logical consistency between the current situation, their future vision and the role that USAID investments could have on moving toward the latter (as it applies to the general field of microenterprise development and the Substantive Area of Involvement or Function for which the offeror has submitted its technical proposal). The offeror should clearly explain their thinking about the role of USAID clients and partners in achieving this vision and practical steps the offeror would take to include clients in program implementation. Offerors should demonstrate their ability to develop communications links that assure that lessons learned in AMAP implementation are shared with others. This will be especially important for the AMAP Support Services component where there is a requirement to coordinate overall program implementation and to fulfill the knowledge generation requirements of this SOW. Offerors should be able to provide a clear and concise description of how they plan to organize themselves to provide the services under the IQC. Of particular interest will be the criteria and system the offeror will use (end of page 99)

NOTE: Other minor revisions to RFP M/OP-01-1363 are noted in Government responses to questions listed above.

No other terms and conditions of RFP M/OP-01-1363 - AMAP are changed as the result of the above. The closing date for submission of proposals remains January 22, 2002.

Section D - Attachments A - Areas of Substantive Involvement and B - Price Evaluation Matrix

ATTACHMENT A - AREAS OF SUBSTANTIVE INVOLVEMENT

Illustrative Involvement of Offerors in
AMAP

<u>Functions</u>	<u>Areas of Substantive Involvement</u>		
	<u>Micro Finance</u>	<u>Business Development Services</u>	<u>Enabling Environment</u>
Strategic Planning	Offeror 1	Offeror 2	Offeror 2
Institutional Support	Offeror 1	Offeror 2	Offeror 2
Human Capacity Development	Offeror 1	Offeror 2	Offeror 2
Monitoring and Evaluation	Offeror 1	Offeror 2	Offeror 2
Knowledge Generation	Offeror 1	Offeror 2	Offeror 2
AMAP Support Services	Offeror 3	Offeror 3	Offeror 3

NOTE: In the above illustrative example Offeror 1 submits One (1) Proposal only for the Micro Finance Area of Substantive Involvement (encompassing all Functions except AMAP Support Services); Offeror 2 submits two (2) separate Proposals for the Business Development Services and Enabling Environment Areas of Substantive Involvement (each encompassing all Functions except AMAP Support Services); Offeror 3 is a small business firm that submits only one (1) Proposal for the AMAP Support Services Function (encompassing all three (3) Areas of Substantive Involvement)

PRICE EVALUATION MATRIX - ATTACHMENT B

The following sets forth the calculations to be utilized for price evaluation under this RFP. The Government will calculate overall average fixed daily rates for both U. S. Personnel and Non-U. S. Personnel. The calculated rates will be used to determine Total Evaluated Price for each offeror.

The chart below provides illustrative fixed daily rates for U. S. Personnel:

U. S. PERSONNEL FIXED DAILY RATES

		U. S. Personnel Fixed Daily Rates		
<u>Labor Category</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Years 1-3</u>	<u>Year 4</u>	<u>Year 5</u>
Labor Category 1				
Level 1	.30	\$500	\$500	\$300
Level 2	.40	\$600	\$600	\$400
Level 3	.30	\$700	\$700	\$500
Weighted Average		\$600	\$600	\$400
Labor Category 2				
Level 1		*	\$600	\$500
Level 2		\$600	\$700	\$600
Level 3		\$700	\$800	\$700
Weighted Average		\$643	\$700	\$600
Labor Category 3				
Level 1		\$200	\$200	\$150
Level 2		\$300	\$300	\$250
Level 3		\$400	\$400	\$350
Weighted Average		\$300	\$300	\$250

NOTES: Weighted averages of the Fixed Daily Rates Levels are made for each Labor Category by Years 1-3, Year 4, and Option Year 5. The weights are as follows: Level 1 (.30); Level 2 (.40); and Level 3 (.30)

*In the above example, there is no rate for Labor Category 2, Level 1; therefore the weights become .57 for Level 2 and .43 for Level 3.

Calculation of Average Fixed Daily Rates of Labor Categories 1-3 by Year:

<u>Labor Category</u>	<u>Years 1-3</u>	<u>Year 4</u>	<u>Option Year 5</u>
1	\$600	\$600	\$400
2	\$643	\$700	\$600
3	\$300	\$300	\$250
Arithmetic Average:	\$514	\$533	\$417

Calculation of Overall Fixed Daily Rate for U. S. Personnel:

$\$514 + \$533 + \$417 = \$1,464/3 = \$488$ (Average Fixed Daily Rate for U. S. Personnel)

Calculation of Total Evaluated Price for U. S. Personnel:

7,200 work days for term of contract * \$488(Average Fixed Daily Rate for U. S. Personnel) = \$3,513,600 (Total Evaluated Price for U. S. Personnel)

NON - U. S. PERSONNEL FIXED DAILY RATES:

<u>Years</u>	<u>Multiplier</u>	<u>Estimated Fixed Daily Rate (Non- U. S. Personnel)*</u>
1-3	1.50	\$170
4	1.70	\$180
5	1.90	\$190

*NOTE: USAID will use the above Estimated Fixed Daily Rates for Non- U. S. Personnel for calculating the Total Evaluated Price of Non- U. S. Personnel.

Calculation of Average Fixed-Daily Rate for Non - U. S. Personnel:

$1.50 * \$170 = \255
 $1.70 * \$180 = \306
 $1.90 * \$190 = \361

$\$255 + \$306 + \$361 = \$922/3 = \$307$ (Average Fixed Daily Rate for Non - U. S. Personnel)

Calculation of Evaluated Price for Non - U. S. Personnel:

3,709 work days for term of contract * \$307 (Average Fixed Daily Rate for Non - U. S. Personnel) = \$1,138,663 (Evaluated Price for Non - U. S. Personnel)

TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE:

\$ 3,513,600 (U. S. Personnel)
\$1,138,663 (Non - U. S. Personnel)

TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE: \$4,652,263

NOTES: 1) Work Days used in the above calculations for U. S. Personnel and Non-U. S. Personnel are numbers developed by and that will be used by USAID in calculating total evaluated prices of all offerors' proposals.

2) Estimated Fixed Daily Rates for Non-U. S. Personnel are numbers developed by and that will be used by USAID in calculating total evaluated prices for non-U. S. Personnel of all offerors' proposals.

3) All calculated numbers in the Price Evaluation Matrix are rounded to the nearest whole number.

PRICE EVALUATION ADJUSTMENT FOR SMALL BUSINESSES:

See Section I.5 FAR 52.219-23 Notice of Price Evaluation Adjustment for Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns

In the above example, assuming the offeror is not a small business firm, then the offeror's Total Evaluated Price of \$4,652,263 would be adjusted upward by 10% (\$465,226) to \$5,117,489.